

(b)(3) CIAAct
(b)(6)

From: Michael Morell [redacted] (b)(6)
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 11:21 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Bill Harlow
Subject: [AIN] Your Review of My Manuscript

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

(b)(3) NatSecAct

[redacted] (b)(3) CIAAct
(b)(6)

Thanks very much for meeting with Bill and me on Wednesday, and thank you very much for your hard work on my manuscript. We really appreciate it. We share the same goal – making sure that we do not publish anything that would damage the ability of the Central Intelligence Agency to carry out its vitally important mission or in anyway put the country at risk.

(b)(3) CIAAct
(b)(6)

Bill and I have carefully gone through the redactions that you are requesting. For a good number of them, we understand why you are asking, it makes sense to us as well (that is, we did not realize something was still classified, like [redacted], and we will accept the redactions. In some cases, this means that we sill simply remove the relevant language. In other cases, as you invited us to do, we are suggesting revisions that we think will alleviate your concerns, and I have listed those suggested edits below. If you disagree with our proposed revisions in these areas, please suggest ones of your own which would satisfy your concerns.

With respect to my overseas assignment, we understand your issue and -- while we do not believe sharing the [redacted]

(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Second, there are a set of redactions where we do not understand why you believe they are problematic, why the Agency believes they would damage sources and methods. Most of these are not major issues, but – without understanding your thinking -- it is hard for us to just remove the language and it is impossible for us to suggest rewrites. I enumerate those areas below, and we would appreciate either hearing a rationale on why the cut is necessary or receiving from you all proposed language changes that, in your view, would make those sentences work. While most issues in this category are minor, some are “major” in that they cover a number of redactions. These fall into four broad categories, and I have outlined them below.

I believe the best way to resolve our areas of concern is to schedule a meeting at HQS where the appropriate decision making officials – that is, NCS or other component reps -- and you all sit down with us and we can together walk through the issues. I would like to schedule such a meeting as soon as possible.

Thanks you very much.

Michael

SUGGESTION REVISIONS: (new language IN CAPS)

(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)

(b)(3) NatSecAct
(b)(5)